



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/903,308	07/11/2001	Masayuki . Chatani	37090-6062	1011

33123 7590 12/28/2004

DAVID A. HALL
HELLER EHRMAN ET AL.
4350 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE #700
SAN DIEGO, CA 92122

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, PHUOC H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant(s) 09/903,308	Applicant(s) CHATANI ET AL.
	Examiner Phuoc H. Nguyen	Art Unit 2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-12,16-18,23-40,44-46,51-68, and 72-74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sahai et al. (Hereafter Sahai) U.S. Patent 6,594,699.

3. Regarding claims 1,30, and 58, Sahai's figure 1 discloses a method of managing the transfer of content to a user device that is communicatively linked to a computer network, comprising: obtaining user device information descriptive of a configuration of the user device (col. 2 lines 61-64; and col. 5 lines 5-6); determining capabilities of the user device to download content over the network and to process content received over the network based upon the user device information (col. 5 lines 5-14); automatically selecting a service level that is available to the user device for transferring content thereto based upon the determined capabilities of the user device, wherein a service level is associated with one or more characteristics of content for transfer to the user device (col. 6 lines 12-49).

4. Regarding claims 2,17,31,45,59, and 73, Sahai further discloses receiving a request to transfer content to the user device over the computer network, and causing content to be transferred to the user device over the network according to the selected service level (Figure 2, and col. 6 lines 12-49).

Art Unit: 2143

5. Regarding claims 3,32, and 60, Sahai further discloses a service level is also associated with one or more characteristics of the manner in which content is transferred to the user device over the network (col. 5 lines 7-26).
6. Regarding claims 4, Sahai further discloses identifying a list of content that can be transferred to the user device based upon the determined capabilities of the user device, and causing the list of content to be displayed at the user device (col. 6, lines 12-23).
7. Regarding claims 5,23,33,51,61, and 79, Sahai further discloses the user device information includes the amount of data (eg. bit rate) that can be transmitted to the user device in a given amount of time over the network (col. 6 lines 12-49).
8. Regarding claims 6,24,34,52,62, and 80, Sahai further discloses the user device information includes the latency of the user device with respect to a content provider device on the computer network (col. 6 lines 12-49).
9. Regarding claims 7,25,35,53,63, and 81, Sahai further discloses the user device information includes the amount of data storage capacity available to the user device (col. 3 lines 23-60).
10. Regarding claims 8,26,36,54,64, and 82, Sahai further discloses the one or more characteristics of content associated with a service level includes the size of the content (col. 4 lines 9-31).
11. Regarding claims 9,27,37,55,65, and 83, Sahai further discloses the one or more characteristics of content includes whether the content includes graphic files (col. 4 lines 9-31).

Art Unit: 2143

12. Regarding claims 10,28,38,56,66, and 84, Sahai further discloses the one or more characteristics of content includes whether the content is an executable file (e.g. Java) (col. 6 last paragraph through col. 7 1st paragraph).

13. Regarding claims 11,29,39,57,67, and 85, Sahai further the manner in which the content is transferred to the user device comprises streaming the content to the user device (Abstract).

14. Regarding claims 12,18,40,46,68, and 74, Sahai further discloses a first service level has a corresponding minimum capabilities requirement, and further comprising selecting a first service level for the user device only if the capabilities of the user device meet the minimum capabilities requirements (col. 6 lines 35-49).

15. Regarding claims 16,44, and 72, Sahai further discloses obtaining user device information descriptive of a configuration of the user device (col. 2 lines 61-64; and col. 5 lines 5-6); identifying one or more service levels that may govern the transfer of content to the user device, wherein each service level is associated with one or more characteristics of content available for transfer to the user device and the manner in which content is transferred to the user device over the network, each service level being further associated with minimum requirements relating to the configuration of the user device, making available at least one of the service levels to the user device for governing the transfer of content to the user device (col. 5 lines 5-14; and col. 6 lines 35-49); automatically selecting a service level to govern the transfer of content to the user device based upon the user device information (col. 6 lines 12-49).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 13-14, 19-21, 41-42, 47-49, 69-70, and 75-77, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahai in view of Lipa et al. (Hereafter, Lipa) U.S. Patent 6,061,722.

Sahai reference disclose selecting a service level for user device based upon the capabilities of the client device; however, Sahai fails to teach if the capabilities of the user device do not meet the minimum capabilities requirement of the user device, notifying the user device that the minimum capabilities requirements are not met; and notifying the user device of changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device in order to upgrade the capabilities of the user device.

Lipa reference teaches if the hardware requirement are not met, notified the user, and gave user suggestion that may be made to the configuration of the user device (col. 2 lines 30-45).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Lipa's teaching into Sahai's method to notify the user when the minimum requirement is not met and provide suggestion what need to be changed that may be made to the user device configuration in order to improve the network connection.

18. Claims 15, 22, 43, 50, 71, and 78, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahai and Lipa in view of Hubbard U.S. Patent 6,654,783.

Sahai and Lipa discloses selecting a service level for user device based upon minimum capabilities requirement of the user device, notifying the user device that the minimum capabilities requirements are not met, and provide suggestion what need to be changed that may be made to the user device configuration; however, Sahai and Lipa fail to teach sending one or more advertisements to the user device regarding changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device.

Hubbard teaches sending one or more advertisements to the user device regarding changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device (col. 9, last paragraph).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate Hubbard's teaching into Sahai and Lipa's method to provide advertisements to the user device regarding changes that may be made to the configuration of the user device in order to attract the user attention.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kalra et al. U.S. Patent 5,953,506

Markowitz et al. U.S. Patent 6,651,103

Gelfer et al. U.S. Patent 6,829,633

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuoc H. Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3919. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon -Thu (7AM-4: 30PM) and off every other Friday.


Art Unit: 2143

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Phuoc H. Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

December 15, 2004


DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100